

# **EXHIBIT 49**

**Redacted Version of  
Document Sought to  
be Sealed**

## Message

**From:** palmer@google.com [palmer@google.com]  
**Sent:** 7/11/2018 4:44:17 PM  
**To:** palmer@google.com; jyasskin@google.com; estark@google.com; kenrb@google.com; ellyjones@google.com; agl@google.com; sleevi@google.com  
**Subject:** AAAA952KuYI-IULXO2v58wc

- palmer@google.com 2018-07-11T16:44:17.423Z

There's some interest in [REDACTED] g [REDACTED] again

- palmer@google.com 2018-07-11T16:44:36.620Z

Mozilla and IPT 2 have everyone what we can do (which is good)

- Updated on 2018-07-11T16:52:30.089Z

Mozilla and IPT 2 have everyone wondering what we can do (which is good)

- palmer@google.com 2018-07-11T16:44:45.067Z

but I remain not on-board with [REDACTED] per se

- palmer@google.com 2018-07-11T16:44:54.465Z

what do other people think?

- jyasskin@google.com 2018-07-11T16:45:08.462Z

Also <https://brave.com/tor-tabs-beta/>.

- <https://brave.com/tor-tabs-beta/>

- Updated on 2018-07-11T16:52:18.703Z

Also <https://brave.com/tor-tabs-beta/>.

- <https://brave.com/tor-tabs-beta/>

- estark@google.com 2018-07-11T16:45:10.704Z

"Mozilla and IPT 2 have everyone what we can do" <-- missing a word?

- kenrb@google.com 2018-07-11T16:49:13.034Z

the question is whether we should consider trying to add web anonymization to Incognito?

- estark@google.com 2018-07-11T16:49:30.440Z

[REDACTED] P [REDACTED] e

- estark@google.com 2018-07-11T16:49:38.983Z

and is basically orthogonal?

- palmer@google.com 2018-07-11T16:51:51.768Z

Oh, sorry: \*wondering\* what we can do

- palmer@google.com 2018-07-11T16:52:12.512Z

@Emily Stark Yes. But, people are just brainstorming.

- estark@google.com 2018-07-11T16:53:06.993Z

@Mike West has lots of Thoughts on the ITP stuff, have you seen any of his docs/brainstorms already?

- palmer@google.com 2018-07-11T16:53:14.634Z

1 idea was to [REDACTED] e [REDACTED] (!!!). I was like, no.

- **kenrb@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:53:23.823Z

██████████ at ██████████ n

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:53:32.557Z

Yeah I joined the ██████████ list, if that's what you mean @Emily Stark

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:54:15.470Z

a fear is that too-good tracking prevention will just escalate the arms race and we'll end up in a Fingerprinting Nightmare World

- **ellyjones@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:54:16.981Z

We looked at this for Chrome OS many years ago also

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:54:20.311Z

yeah

- **estark@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:54:25.686Z

in a former life I worked on a project to bundle a node in every webpage ☺

- **ellyjones@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:54:31.290Z

and the ██████████ people hard passed on the idea of shipping a ██████████ node on each chromebook - it would have demolished their infra

- **ellyjones@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:54:49.786Z

(this was in like 2011 so maybe things have changed)

- **ellyjones@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:55:03.495Z

I know Sleeve has strong feelings about ██████████ g ██████████ s

- **estark@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:55:45.126Z

@Chris Palmer I also fear the Prompt On Every Subresource For Every Webpage Nightmare World

- **kenrb@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:56:09.079Z

@Chris Palmer but maybe we can reduce fingerprinting vectors to the point where few people are individually distinguishable

- **ellyjones@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:56:19.715Z

"This website would like to load an image. [Allow] [Deny]"

- **agl@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:58:17.233Z

Clearly the answer is for the whole world to use AMP, then we can expose the AMP cache via a Private Information Retrieval protocol and disable Javascript when rendering.

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:59:15.671Z

that is... wow

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T16:59:25.640Z

If I weren't already sitting down, I'd need to sit down

- **jyasskin@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:00:45.654Z

I assume everyone's seen <https://www.blaseur.com/papers/www18privatebrowsing.pdf>? (Thanks @Martin Shelton)

- <https://www.blaseur.com/papers/www18privatebrowsing.pdf>

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:01:04.761Z

yep, I am waving it in front of people

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:01:36.786Z

I am going to get back on my old shit of yelling that we need to stop calling it Incognito and stop using a Spy Guy icon

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:01:40.468Z

Temporary Mode

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:02:27.381Z

although that paper does note that people were least confused by Chrome's disclosure (their word for the disclaimer/explainer language)

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:02:54.443Z

Incognito: Voted Least Confusing Private Mode, 2018

- **ellyjones@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:04:37.562Z

good news palmer

- **ellyjones@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:04:47.313Z

we're working on a Dark Mode for Mac Chrome that will probably look quite a bit like incognito

- **kenrb@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:05:32.947Z

call it 'Dark Web Mode'

- **ellyjones@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:05:50.778Z

I love it

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:06:44.351Z

sob

- **kenrb@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:07:04.006Z

@Chris Palmer I know the 'incognito' war was waged and lost years ago, but do you remember why? It has always been a misleading name

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:07:22.790Z

Just as long as we don't get a Dark Intellectual Web Mode

(<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/08/opinion/intellectual-dark-web.html>)

- <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/08/opinion/intellectual-dark-web.html>

- **ellyjones@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:07:40.746Z

regardless of the name, the icon should always have been [http://simpsons.wikia.com/wiki/Guy\\_Incognito](http://simpsons.wikia.com/wiki/Guy_Incognito)

- [http://simpsons.wikia.com/wiki/Guy\\_Incognito](http://simpsons.wikia.com/wiki/Guy_Incognito)

- **ellyjones@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:07:49.327Z

which also accurately conveys the level of privacy it provides I think

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:08:13.654Z

@Ken Buchanan They didn't believe me that people would get confused; and they were still loving the Aw, Snap!/i18n-resistant whimsy thing

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:08:17.227Z

Maybe now is the time

- **kenrb@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:08:37.081Z

I see

- **palmer@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:08:38.747Z

now that we have results from, among others, a person we offered an Enamel job to (Sascha Fahl, co-author)

- **kenrb@google.com** 2018-07-11T17:09:13.964Z

"We have this wall of text explaining to people that incognito doesn't mean unrecognizable, when we use it"

- **sleevi@google.com** 2018-07-11T20:03:52.557Z

Yes, Eric Roman has similarly Strong Feelings about [REDACTED] p [REDACTED]s. In theory, I'm not opposed to [REDACTED] h [REDACTED] S [REDACTED] e [REDACTED] g [REDACTED] y [REDACTED] S [REDACTED] is that it's largely un(der?)staffed. Between [REDACTED] + [REDACTED] s [REDACTED], things just get... really weird and unpredictable. I mean, same as Android, just more weird. [REDACTED] st [REDACTED] h [REDACTED]